

History of Classroom Location Lists

In the Summer of 1997, NGB-ART sent a letter to each of the TAGs, identifying the parameters to be considered in site selection for DL classrooms and a request that each identify the cities in which they needed to have a classroom. The responses, together with NGB identified leadership locations, identified a total of 654 classroom locations. In the Fall of 1998, this was reduced to 639 by eliminating Federal locations such as the counter-drug schools and courseware origination points.

Over the same period, working independently, TRADOC established a need for 745 classrooms to support the Active Army and the USAR. The lists developed by NGB-ART and by TRADOC were not reconciled nor coordinated.

At the behest of the Army Comptroller, as implemented by a Council of Colonels convened to adjudicate issues not resolved between DTTP and TADLP, a series of meetings with TRADOC, NGB, and USAR representatives started in February 1999. Procedures and decision rules used at these meetings have been well documented and circulated among the principals of all three components and DA. The principle rules used at those initial meetings were:

- 1) Each classroom is to be available to soldiers from all three components
- 2) Number and size of classrooms was determined based on the calculation that each student workstation can support a population of up to 100 soldiers
- 3) The objective was to have a classroom within 50 miles of 95% of the Force
- 4) Classrooms were to be sponsored by the component with the largest population in that location
- 5) Fielding was to concentrate on reaching large populations first

The immediate result of application of the rules was to combine the 639 ARNG classrooms and the 745 TADLP classrooms into a Combined List of 842 classrooms.

Throughout these meetings and at each Council of Colonels, NGB said that the Combined List was not complete for five reasons:

- 1) Inaccurate population data was used as the basis for determining the number of student workstations at a given site and the sponsor for that site. *Current status:* COL Olson, TRADOC, did not disagree with this and agreed to have a new population analysis performed. The analysis has been developed by ARNG, but has not yet been discussed in a tri-

component meeting. The objective should be to provide a classroom within 50 miles of 95% of the soldiers in each state. This will be resolved as a part of the population study effort.

- 2) The list must be approved by the TAGs before it can be considered firm. *Current status:* It is understood that the TAGs have local knowledge and the primary responsibility for training their troops.
- 3) The reality of what DTTP had already installed was not reflected in the list. *Current status:* Current fielding is generally reflected in the current combined list.
- 4) The reconciliation of ARNG versus USAR sponsorship at conflicting sites has not been resolved. *Current status:* COL Olson considers this to be an RC issue and expects the RC components to resolve it.
- 5) NGB was not satisfied with the fielding sequence (based on largest population first) represented by the list. *Current status:* Training requirements are being allowed to drive the installation priorities.

The issue of which component sponsors a classroom was clouded by the issue of cross-component resourcing. That is, if one component uses a classroom sponsored by another component, how do the costs of operation get funded. In August, a tri-component IPT was convened to address this issue. Army Regulations and a cross-component resourcing MOU signed by each of the components clearly specifies how cost will be funded for all planned military training and that unplanned training will be supported by the component receiving the training. Military DL training clearly falls within the management and resourcing of the SMDR process and ATRRS. This is expected to resolve the issue. Therefore, the issue of sponsorship can be resolved within the next few months.

Fielding Plan

This is the current DTTP Fielding Plan. Remember that NGB-ART-DL (CPT Paul Veneziano) has the responsibility for establishing classroom requirements, including size, location, and priority sequence. The DTTP Fielding Manager (MAJ Tim Kadavy) establishes and manages the specific fielding schedule to meet ART requirements.

Column A is the classroom sequence number from the Combined List.

Column B is the base city in or near which the classroom is to be located. Any address in or within several miles of this city is entirely acceptable.

Column C is the Site Number

Column D gives the size of the classroom to be installed in terms of student workstations.

Column E through I specifies the month and year for which installation is planned.

Combined List Population from SIDPERS

This list is the combined, tri-component list of all Army DL Classrooms. Remember that each classroom is available to train any soldier. Only the ARNG classrooms will be available for shared use.

The basic list was developed based on a TRADOC generated, ASIP based population study. The difference between ASIP and SIDPERS populations is that ASIP used duty station and the SIDPERS analysis used current residence. Since the objective is to deliver training to the convenience of the soldier, current residence is considered by ARNG a more practical metric.

A tri-component group started with an active component installation and specified the number of classrooms required to satisfy that population. Then, a city approximately 100 miles away was selected and the number of classrooms determined to satisfy that population. For those cities with a dominant ARNG population, a city designated by the appropriate TAG was generally used. Then another city approximately 100 miles away was selected and so on until the entire state was covered. Sequence numbers were assigned based upon largest cities first.

Column A is the Combined List sequence number.

Column C is the City or Post

Column D designates the sponsor, that is fielding and operating component

Column E is the classroom number

Column F is the population of Active Component soldiers resident within 50 miles of a specified zip code

Column G is the population of ARNG soldiers resident within 50 miles of a specified zip code

Column H is the population of USAR soldiers resident within 50 miles of a specified zip code

Column I is the total population of all Component soldiers resident within 50 miles of a specified zip code

Column J gives the number of student workstations planned for that site in the current Combined List. Note that Active component classrooms have 16 workstations, USAR classrooms have 12 workstations, and ARNG classrooms have 18, 12, or 3 workstations.

Column K is Column I state total divided by 100. Each workstation should support 100 soldiers.

Column L is the difference between Column J and Column K.

Column M is the year planned for installation in the Combined List.

Note that, in Column G for each state, a known total population is given and the percentage of that population identified as within 50 miles of a classroom. The objective is to have 95% of the population in each state (except Alaska) within 50 miles of a classroom.